Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
Queen's University - University of Toronto Libraries

http://archive.org/details/conciliationorco00luso

CONCILIATION;

OR,

CONSIDERATIONS

ON THE

ORIGIN AND TERMINATION

OF THE

PRESENT WAR.

London:

PRINTED FOR G. SAEL, NO. 192, STRAND.

1797.

ERRATA.

Page 5, line 12, for *paſſion* read *poiſon*.
— 15, — 1, for *To* read *to*, and inſert a comma after *war*, in laſt line, page 14.
— 19, — 18, for *money* read *mercy*.
— 21, — 18, after *victims* add *was to torment them*.
— 23, — 8, for *were* read *was*.
— 25, — 3, for *profeſs* read *poſſeſs*.
— 30, — 1, for *of* read *to*.
— 31, — 19, dele *the*.
— 56, — 14 and 15, for *maſſacre* and *plunder* read *maſſacres* and *plunders*.
— 59, — 11, for *fully* read *baſely*.
— Ib. — 16 and 18, for *With* read *To*.
— 60, — 3, dele *comma* after *receive*.
— 67, — 4, for *is an additional proof* read *are additional proofs*.
— 71, — 12, for *droit* read *droits*.
— 72, The reference placed at line 2 ſhould be at the words *inverted education*, line 14.
— 79, laſt line, for *ſucceſſive war* read *ſucceſſion war*.
— 83, for *conqueſt* read *conqueſts*.
— 85, for *that* read *the*.

CONCILIATION,

&c.

AT this awful and momentous ſtage of a war, in which Britain has been upwards of four years engaged, and which has ſpread ſlaughter and deſolation over Europe, and extended its baleful influence to the remoteſt regions of the globe, an inveſtigation of the cauſes from whence it originated, or a ſolution of the queſtion—"by whom "was it begun?" can only be of utility or importance, by introducing among the belligerent powers ſuch a ſalutary conviction of mutual errors, ſuch a ſincere and reciprocal ſpirit of *Conciliation*, as may promote the deſirable and neceſſary concluſion of an equitable, permanent peace.

It has been the conſtant practice of hoſtile nations, at the commencement of a war, to fix on

 their

their opponents the charge of unprovoked or unjuſt aggreſſion; though it frequently happens that this heavy guilt of thus wantonly engaging in war, and the awful reſponſibility for its inevitable and dreadful conſequences, belong not excluſively to either.

But in all caſes where the belligerent powers mutually reſolve to refer their unacknowledged pretenſions to the dreadful deciſion of arms, aggreſſion, ſo far from being the cauſe of the war, is merely an effect originating from this previous determination.

There are many caſes, as well in the tranſactions between different governments as in private life, ſo doubtful in themſelves, and ſo liable to miſrepreſentation from the paſſions, the prejudices, and even the various opinions of mankind, that ſincerity may not only be compatible with error, but frequently is a complete extenuation of criminality.

Some maxims, however, are ſo indubitably true, and ſo univerſally admitted, that a deviation from them is demonſtratively erroneous and unjuſt; in all ſuch caſes a pretended belief in the rectitude of conduct reſulting from oppoſite prin-

ciples, ſo far from extenuating, is an aggravation of the offence, ſince it is adding hypocriſy to conſcious premeditated guilt.

No one will be hardy enough to deny the truth of the following propoſition: "That every inde-"pendent nation has a right to adopt whatever "form of government it thinks proper;" and conſequently, "that no one nation can have a "right to impoſe on any other the government "it may adopt for itſelf."

It neceſſarily follows, that if the founders of the *ſoi-diſant* republic of France, not content with maintaining, as a ſpeculative opinion, that all other governments are uſurpations on Liberty, Equality, and the Rights of Man, endeavoured to propagate this abſurd and deſtructive poſition in the neighbouring nations, by clandeſtine attempts to render their governments hateful or contemptible to them, by open, avowed invitations to revolt, and by an explicit aſſurance that they would aſſiſt any nation diſſatisfied with its preſent government, in effecting its emancipation from what they termed a ſtate of ignominious ſlavery, they left no alternative to thoſe nations, whoſe civil eſtabliſhments they thus attempted to undermine, or ſubvert, but to *fraternize* or reſiſt.

How far the above is a true or falſe repreſentation of the principles and conduct of that faction which endeavoured to eſtabliſh and perpetuate in France an oppreſſive, military oligarchy, under the ſpecious name of a free democracy, at the cloſe of the year 1792, will beſt appear by a retroſpect of the revolution from which the conſtitution of 1789 originated.

This memorable revolution will be recorded in hiſtory, not only as the moſt remarkable occurrence in this eventful era, but in the annals of the world itſelf.

Stimulated to juſt reſiſtance by a long, uninterrupted ſucceſſion of tyranny, one of the greateſt and moſt enlightened nations on earth nobly dared to rouſe its gigantic, reſiſtleſs ſtrength, to break its ignominious fetters, to aſſert its freedom, and to demand its rights.

For this, the people of France merited, and for this they will doubtleſs obtain, the applauſe and admiration of ſucceeding ages.

But with the deſtruction of the Baſtille, and the ſubverſion of that tyrannic ſyſtem which armed it with its terrors, the ſhort-lived triumph of freedom

dom ends. It was not the altar of liberty, but of faction, that was erected on the ruins of this fortreſs of deſpotiſm.

No nation had ever a fairer opportunity to eſtabliſh a free and permanent conſtitution; and there undoubtedly were, in the firſt conſtituent aſſembly, men of ability and virtue equal to the arduous taſk.

But the "ſtill ſmall voice" of reaſon and truth could not be heard amid the roar of contending factions, and the frantic orgies of a people intoxicated with the ſubtile paſſion of deſigning demagogues, who artfully taught them to believe that every ſocial reſtriction was treaſon to the "Rights "of Man"; that equality, not only of protection but of ſtation, was eſſential to civil liberty; and, finally, that monarchy, diveſted of power, but loaded with reſponſibility, was to be retained juſt long enough to make it hated, ridiculed, and deſpiſed, and then to be ignominiouſly degraded, and wantonly deſtroyed, to make way for that perfect, immaculate phenomenon in government, a pure democracy of Jacobins, inveſted with ſupreme power, and ſubject to no controul but the ſuperintending wiſdom and ſovereign voice of a Pariſian mob!

Thus

Thus wickedly and fatally was the liberty of France ſacrificed to a worthleſs faction; and a conſtitution, marked with ſtrong, expreſſive traits of a divine origin, ſtrangled at its birth.

The abuſed, inſulted populace, goaded by their unprincipled apoſtate leaders, and accelerated by that impetuous volatility which is their national characteriſtic, preſſed on in a headlong, furious courſe, rapidly paſſing the bounds of liberty, juſtice, and reaſon, and ignorantly purſuing "the reverſe of wrong for right," till they reached the oppoſite extreme of ſocial evil, more dreadful than deſpotiſm itſelf; they madly erected the ſtandard of anarchy, the bloody ſignal for indiſcriminate fury, ſlaughter, and devaſtation.

To miſtake vengeance for juſtice, and retaliation of evil for redreſs, are too common yet fatal errors. In private life they are frequently ſucceeded by ſufferings and deep remorſe; and when nations are actuated by principles ſo erroneous and depraved, they ſeldom eſcape a ſevere retribution.

How awfully is this diſtributive juſtice exemplified by the late eventful hiſtory, and preſent dreadful ſtate of France! Her monarchy dates its fall

fall from its unjuſt interference in the war between Britain and America; from its inſidious endeavours to undermine a power it was too feeble to ſubvert.

The conquerors of the Baſtille, elated with their victory, reſtrained by no principle of religion, juſtice, or humanity, and inflamed by the inſatiable paſſions of avarice, ambition, and revenge, became, under the ſkilful management of their leaders, the inſtruments of a tyranny far more deſpotic and ſanguinary than any that ever has been recorded in hiſtory; and largely participated in the miſeries they produced.

A puniſhment equally juſt, exemplary, and ſevere, awaited the factious demagogues themſelves; eagle-eyed in diſcovering, and indefatigable in adopting, the ſureſt means to attain the object of their ambition, yet blind to the inevitable conſequences that muſt enſue from a ſyſtem ſo ſuper-eminent in atrocity, they ſaw not that the guillotine, which had glutted their vengeance, gratified their avarice, and ſuſtained their power, would fall with avenging juſtice on their devoted heads.

How

How exemplary is the admonition which the revolution in France affords to the ſurrounding governments and nations! how ſtrongly does it inculcate thoſe divine truths, that a people who are deſtitute of religion, virtue, or humanity, cannot be free; nor a government founded on atheiſm, terror, profligacy, and coercion, ſecure!

"Dark, intricate," and inſcrutable as the ways of heaven appear to the circumſcribed, dubious view of human reaſon; ſtrange as it may ſeem that the innocent ſhould frequently ſuffer the puniſhment due to the guilty, that "the people "ſhould bleed when their governors run mad;"* yet the invariable, the inſeparable connection between the probity and proſperity, the profligacy and decline, of nations and of empires, proves, beyond the poſſibility of a doubt, the moral agency—the over-ruling providence of God.

Had the court, the nobles, the national aſſembly, and the people of France, been actuated by principles of virtue, moderation, and mutual confidence, the conſtitution of 1789 might have been rendered at once reſpectable and permanent; and Europe might have eſcaped the horrors of

* Delirant reges, plectuntur Achivi.

this

this desolating war; but the general depravity and insincerity, the contention of passions, interests, and prejudices, artfully inflamed and systematically directed by that ascendant faction, which soon after obtained for itself a local habitation and a name,* not only obscured the opening dawn of liberty in France, but involved the neighbouring nations in the deepening—still impending gloom of that wide-wasting storm their sanguinary ambition has raised.

Secure in the implicit obedience of the profligate, sanguinary populace of Paris, whom a similarity of dispositon and desires attached to their interest, and a conscious inferiority of intellect subjected to their power, they wanted not, nor indeed could they possibly have obtained, an engine better calculated to insure their success.

Intimately acquainted with its latent springs, they could direct all its movements at pleasure, and accommodate it with equal facility to the varied scenes and incidents of their tragic drama. A spectacle, a tumult, or a massacre, they could produce with a wish, whenever it was their object to amuse, to intimidate, or to destroy.

* The Jacobins.

Even the enemies of the Jacobins muſt acknowledge, they were no leſs fertile in expedients than judicious in the uſe of them.

They knew that their comprehenſive plan, which included not only the attainment of abſolute power in France, but the ſubjugation or ſubverſion of all the neighbouring governments, muſt expand by degrees, and might by a proper combination be ſo contrived, as to render the firſt of theſe deſigns ſubſervient to the ſecond.

Senſible that the conſtitution of 1789 had neither ſtability nor conſiſtence to render it permanent, they were not only content, but gratified by the trial of ſo hopeleſs an experiment.

They therefore manifeſted an alacrity, no leſs prompt, than that of the real champions of liberty; and the blind deluded populace, in the ſolemn confederation of the 14th of July, in the Champ de Mars.

To theſe eminent legiſlators and philoſophers, whoſe ſuperior intellects, and convenient conſciences, enable them to reject the idea of a *God*, and a future ſtate, as vain chimeras of the vulgar multitude,

multitude, nothing could be more trivial than the obligations of an oath. How admirably then, was this national pageant in every reſpect adapted to the promotion of their views!

The regulated concourſe of an innumerable multitude of all ages and conditions, annually aſſembled to confirm, by a ſolemn oath, the conſtitution, which was to ſecure to the whole French nation "liberty, equality, and the rights of man;" the enlivening and "ſpirit-ſtirring" ſounds of vocal and inſtrumental muſic, celebrating in patriotic and martial hymns the praiſes and triumphs of freedom; occaſionally interrupted by the roar of cannon, and the acclamations of enraptured millions; and the altar of liberty, decorated with its appropriate emblems and devices; formed altogether as grand and animating a pageant as it was poſſible for human art to exhibit, or even for imagination to conceive.

The abaſement of royalty, which occupied an inferior ſtation, and had a ſubordinate and humiliating part aſſigned it, in this auguſt and impoſing ſpectacle, was admirably calculated to heighten the ſtage effect, by abating the ancient national veneration and love of monarchy, and inſpiring the aſtoniſhed populace, who were at once ſpec-

tators and actors of the lofty ſcene, with high ideas of their own conſequence and eſtimation.

In any country a ſpectacle ſo uncommon and ſo ſublime, would have been deeply impreſſive; but in France it was faſcinating; and raiſed a fervour of enthuſiaſm which the popular leaders took all imaginable care to maintain, by ſucceſſive appeals to their paſſions. In the hall of the Jacobins, hung round with the chains, iron cages, and various engines of tyranny or torture, ſuppoſed to be taken from the ruins of the Baſtille, the people ſaw at once the trophies of their conqueſt, and the incentives of their revenge. The deſtruction of the royal ſtatues and emblems, and the abolition of all armorial and hereditary honours, admoniſhed them that monarchy and nobility being at all times, *and in all countries*, uſurpations on the rights of man, were fallen in France, never to riſe again. The inſcriptions of liberty and equality, which every where met the eye; the ſtudied vulgarity of ſalutation and language; the ſhameleſs profligacy of manners, and the ſqualid meanneſs of attire, were the glorious triumphs of Sanſculottiſm: the fulſome incenſe offered by hypocriſy to folly! The apotheoſis of reaſon, perſonified by a female, of whom the famous Dr. Graham's goddeſs of health was probably the prototype,

prototype, was an admirable device to perſuade the people that religion was no more than a bugbear and an impoſition; and the *ſignificant* inſcription, which pointed out their cemeteries as "the realms of eternal ſleep," was well calculated to ſilence the murmurs of conſcience, to extinguiſh the feelings of humanity, and to baniſh the dread of retribution.

Nor was there leſs of policy, in the progreſſive ſyſtematic cruelty, with which the Jacobin faction treated the ill-fated Royal Family of France.

Conſcious of the high veneration in which monarchy was held in France till the late ſudden revolution, they could not be ignorant that it had ſtill many ſtrenuous adherents in the diſtant provinces, and perhaps even in the capital itſelf. It was no leſs evident that whatever acts of tyranny and oppreſſion might, according to the deſpotic conſtitution of the French monarchy, have been committed under the ſanction of his name, Louis XVI. ſo far from being himſelf a tyrant, was poſſeſſed of a diſpoſition remarkably placid and humane. Their object therefore was, to make not only the monarchy itſelf, but the unhappy king, "who bore his faculties thus meekly," odious to the people before they ventured on

"The deep damnation of his taking off."

In the rapid reflux of popular opinion, nothing is more common than the tranſition from veneration to contempt.

Hiſtory abounds in examples of this fluctuation, the cauſe of which is coeval with human nature, and reſults from its imperfections and perverſeneſs, always varying in its unſtable judgment to oppoſite extremes, and unreaſonably depreciating what it has fondly over valued.

The malignant, ſanguinary faction, ſaw that this, as well as every other defect or vice incident to the nature of man, might be made ſubſervient to their deſigns; and it would be unjuſt to their penetration and genius to deny their ſkill in the application of the vileſt principles to the moſt iniquitous purpoſes.

To enter into a circumſtantial detail of events ſo recent would be ſuperfluous; ſince it is the ſole object of this eſſay to conciliate, not to inflame, the unreaſonable and moſt impolitic animoſity that now, too fatally for France and Britain, exerts its exterminating influence in this indeciſive war—

To

To prove that it is the reciprocal intereſt of both theſe nations, that it is equally the duty of both their governments, to terminate the deſtructive conteſt, not only by a juſt and honourable peace, founded on reciprocal conceſſion, forbearance, and oblivion of ancient enmity and preſent injury, but (however incongruous the idea may at firſt ſight appear) by a ſincere, permanent ALLIANCE.

No meaſure ſhort of this can *ſecure* the repoſe of Europe. The *abſurd*, the horrid idea of natural enmity between Britain and France, muſt either be eternally extinguiſhed, or its ſmothered embers will ſoon again burſt forth in dreadful conflagration.

But this amity, which cannot be ſincere without a reciprocal renunciation of ambition, abaſement of pride, and, in ſhort, without a total dereliction of the opinions, a total revolution in the principles by which England and France have for many centuries been governed, can only proceed from that moſt difficult of all human exertions, A MUTUAL ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ERROR.*

* This ſubject is more fully diſcuſſed in the Second Section.

Poſſibly

Poſſibly this is too much for any one who is not a philoſopher, a maniac, or an ideot, to expect. It is at leaſt totally different from the *wiſe* policy of the moſt ſagacious cabinets, and the moſt celebrated miniſters, that the preſent or any other century ſince the Chriſtian æra, or even the annals of the world itſelf can produce.

This, it muſt be acknowledged, is a melancholy truth; but let any man of common ſenſe, reflection, and humanity, look back but to the commencement of the preſent century, and he muſt deeply lament the dreadful conſequences of theſe ſagacious counſels. Nay, let him look back no farther than the laſt nine years, let him attentively contemplate the proſpect of Europe at the preſent awful moment, and ſurely, if not loſt to ſenſibility, he will ſtart with horror as from a frightful dream; and when he views the bloody triumphs of Britain, of Auſtria, and of France, and the impending ruin of them all, he will indignantly exclaim, is *this the age of reaſon?*

But returning from this digreſſion, and reſuming the ſubject which gave riſe to it, the reader will eaſily perceive the adroitneſs with which the Jacobins availed themſelves of the errors of their opponents,

opponents, the prejudices of their adherents, and the weakneſs of human nature itſelf, to promote their ſanguinary and ambitious deſigns.

The attempt made by the King and Queen to fly from premeditated deſtruction, their interception and moſt degrading return to Paris, were events as favourable to the views of their enemies as they could poſſibly deſire. Every concurrent circumſtance attending this unfortunate attempt, which was almoſt at the moment of its completion fruſtrated, more by the indolence and humanity of the King, than by the activity or vigilance of his purſuers, tended ſtill more to degrade him in the public opinion. Nothing was more eaſy than to inflame the minds of the populace, by repreſenting this meaſure in the blackeſt colours; they required no evidence to convince them that it was a direct violation of the conſtitution Louis had ſworn to maintain; and a plan, preconcerted between him and the enemies of that conſtitution, to reinſtate him in the plenitude of his former deſpotic power.

Bold aſſertion, totally unſupported by proof, was ſufficient to eſtabliſh, in the prejudiced minds of the enraged multitude, the certainty of the king's duplicity in this tranſaction; though the

ignominious manner in which he was brought back to the Thuilleries, clearly demonſtrates that he was regarded by his unfeeling conductors, and their unprincipled employers, as a priſoner *returned* to his jail.

That captivity was the ſtate of the unhappy King and Queen, from the day of their entrance into Paris to that of their murder on the ſcaffold, cannot admit of a doubt; and it is equally true that, during the long and melancholy period of its continuance, they ſuffered a complication of indignities as degrading, and miſeries as ſevere, as the moſt refined, ingenious malignity could invent, or the moſt hardened, unrelenting cruelty could inflict.

Theſe unexampled trials the royal ſufferers ſuſtained with a dignified, calm, collected fortitude, which they never would have been thought to have poſſeſſed, had it not been for the very extraordinary events which called forth their latent virtues into action.

The treatment they experienced from the Jacobins on their return to captivity, nearly reſembled that which a culprit, condemned to die, and ſtriving to ſave his devoted life by eluding the vigilance

lance of his keepers, would receive from their liberality on being reconducted to jail. The weight of his fetters muſt be encreaſed to prevent force, the number of his guards muſt be augmented to counteract ſtratagem; the very ſmall catalogue of a priſoner's comforts muſt be abridged, to puniſh the heinous offence of ſeeking ſelf-preſe vation.

The humanity of the faction doubtleſs felt a ſevere ſhock when obliged, by a ſeverity no leſs coercive, to reſtrain the violence, to countermine the fraud, and to puniſh the guilt of their royal priſoners; but their ſacred love of liberty, their veneration for the conſtitution they had *ſworn* to maintain, and their delicate ſcrupuloſity in the obſervance of ſo ſolemn and conſcientious an obligation as an oath, were motives too potent even for the love of money implanted in their benevolent hearts to combat; a ſenſe of duty therefore prevailed over the weakneſs of their nature.

——— " Mercy left her throne,
" And juſtice ſternly took her place to govern."

TAMERLANE.

No lenity was, in future, to be ſhewn to the royal criminals, who had preſumed to take a

clandeſtine flight from the bleſſed abode of "liberty, equality, and the rights of man!"

It was not ſufficient that they were precluded from the poſſibility of eſcape, and ſurrounded by a furious multitude, thirſting for their blood; thouſands of their faithful adherents and gallant defenders muſt be maſſacred before their eyes, ere they were permitted to cloſe them for ever; and 20,000 choſen champions of liberty were invited to the capital, that they might ſhare the glories and the triumphs of the brave Pariſian ſans culottes. The decree had paſſed the national aſſembly, and the King was required to give it his aſſent. Had they enjoined him to ſign the death warrant of himſelf and family, they might with equal reaſon and juſtice have expected his compliance; but to the Jacobin faction his acquieſence or refuſal was of little moment, ſince the former would render him deſpicable in the opinion of the people at large, and the latter would expoſe him to the vengeance of the Pariſian mob.

This, however, he had the fortitude to prefer, and, with a firmneſs which he was not ſuſpected to poſſeſs, exerciſed the power veſted in him by the conſtitution of refuſing his aſſent to the decree.

This decided oppoſition to a meaſure, calculated not only for his own deſtruction, but for the ſubverſion of the conſtitution itſelf, was repreſented by the Jacobins, and regarded by the populace, as an audacious avowal of tyranny, and wound up their minds to that decree of enthuſiaſtic ferocity neceſſary for the ſanguinary work their deſpots had deſtined them to perform.

By an ingenious refinement in the art of tormenting, which might probably have exceeded the ſagacity of a Nero, a Caligula, or a Maximin, theſe adepts in the ſcience contrived

"To feed deſtruction with a lingering act."

and to fill the intermediate buſy ſcenes with a wonderful variety of diſtreſs.

On the 20th of June 1792, a tumultuous rabble, whoſe only object in demanding, or rather in forcing admittance to the royal victims, were ſkilfully inſtructed to awaken terror by alarm, to embitter inſult with contumely, and to ſharpen contempt by deriſion; a proficiency ſo unrivalled in the ſcience of torture, reflects the higheſt degree of credit on the ingenuity and diſcernment, if not on the humanity of their employers. How degrading to human nature were the motley ſcenes of diſtreſs, mirth, and rage, exhibited that day

at

at the Thuilleries. Yet how clearly did this demonſtrate the frivolity, as well as ferocity of a rabble, who could thus aſſociate ridicule with barbarity, and extract pleaſure from the wanton and ludicrous perſecution of miſery.

This full gratification of theſe extraordinary propenſities was undoubtedly a judicious preparation of the actors for the tragedies they were to perform on the 10th of Auguſt and 2d of September, in the ſame year.

But as it is by no means neceſſary, it certainly cannot be deſirable, to obtrude on the averted eyes of the public, ſcenes ſo abhorrent to humanity, ſo diſgraceful to the age and nation in which they were exhibited.

The only intention of the writer in this review of the leading events in France, from the deſtruction of the Baſtille to the ſubverſion of the conſtitution of 1789, is to prove, that they evidently reſulted from the regular developement of a plan, moſt artfully arranged, and ſucceſsfully executed, by the Jacobin, or (as it is commonly called) the republican faction, to eſtabliſh for *themſelves* a deſpotic tyranny in France, and to extend it through-

throughout Europe, under the ſpecious names of liberty, equality, and fraternity.

Hypocriſy and enthuſiaſm are no leſs inimical to liberty than to religion; and the danger which civil ſociety has to fear from the influence of political impoſition, though at all times greater than any to be apprehended from pious fraud, was never more juſtly to be dreaded than at the preſent alarming criſis.

The intolerant perſecuting ſpirit of religious bigotry exiſts no longer, and the enthuſiaſm of the preſent day is not merely harmleſs, it is highly beneficial. It reſtrains the vicious, and promotes the virtuous propenſities and habits of the lower orders of the community: it inculcates on their minds the neceſſity of ſubmitting to that ſocial ſubordination, without which ſociety cannot exiſt.

Such, at leaſt, are the principles of thoſe ſectaries in Britain who are denominated enthuſiaſts. The miniſters of the eſtabliſhed church itſelf are not more conſtant, nor more urgent, than the preachers of methodiſm, in admoniſhing their hearers to yeild willing obedience and ſteady ſupport to that mild and equitable ſyſtem of laws, which

which ſecures to them their liberty, their property, and their lives.

They return their ſincere and grateful thanks to heaven, that they are ſubjects of a government which repays obedience with protection; which will inſure to *Britons*, while it exiſts unimpaired, the greateſt meaſure of EQUALITY the exiſtence of civil ſociety will admit; which guaranties to every rank in the community the SOCIAL RIGHTS OF MAN.

How oppoſite, how dreadful, are the effects of hypocriſy operating on political enthuſiaſm in in France!

The apoſtles of "liberty, equality, fraternity, "and the rights of man," are numerous, and "by their fruits ye ſhall know them."

To deny, that among the founders of this new ſect, and even among its preſent leaders, there are men of ſuperior abilities would be no leſs abſurd than to ſuppoſe the vigour of their mental powers were impaired, or the exerciſe of them reſtrained, by the unwelcome intruſion of religion, conſcience, virtue, or humanity.

But

But their inferior agents, their miſſionaries for the propagation of their "glad tidings," neither profeſs nor want any ſuperior degree of natural or acquired knowledge.

The eſſential requiſites for a mob-orator are by no means difficult to be found in men of common abilities; real or ſimulated enthuſiaſm, vehement geſture, and fluency of elocution, ſtrength of lungs, coarſe, vulgar abuſe, and unmeaning bombaſt, are fully ſufficient.

Orators of this "common mould" abounded in France at the commencement of the revolution, and their ſpeeches, not only in the National Aſſembly, but in all places of public reſort, contributed probably much more to the abolition of the hierarchy and nobility, and the conſequent deſtruction of the royal family, of monarchy itſelf, and of the conſtitution of 1789, than the moſt elaborate writings of their juſtly celebrated philoſophers could have done.

The inflated harangues in the national and conſtituent aſſemblies, were exactly level to the capacities, and well-calculated to inflame the paſſions of the mob within doors and without. The ſans culotte orators, whoſe ſpeeches were

moſt violent, were ſure to receive the gratulation of the Mountain and the gallery. Many of them, it muſt be confeſſed, were no mean proficients in the rapid, vehement oratory, ſo impreſſive on the minds of vulgar auditors. That ſome of them poſſeſſed, in an eminent degree,

> " Action and utterance, and the power of words,
> " To ſtir men's minds to mutiny and rage,"

has been fatally proved by the ſanguinary fury which they inſpired into the deluded multitude, and the atrocious deeds which were in conſequence committed on the 10th of Auguſt and 2d of September, 1792. At this dreadful period the conſtitution of 1789 was ſubverted, the King and his unhappy family were impriſoned, and deſpotiſm fixed her bloody throne in the hall of the Jacobins; this tyrannic faction governed the populace; the populace, under their direction, kept the national aſſembly in a ſtate of abject fear and implicit obedience; and ſuch were the delegates of the French nation, who ſanctioned the murder of Louis XVI. and formed the conſtitution of 1792.*

This

* The following anecdote, from Miſs H. M. Williams's Letters, will illuſtrate at once the inſolent pretenſions of the mob, and the abject ſtate of the national aſſembly.—A member being ill treated in his paſſage to the houſe, aſked the

This conſtitution, founded on perjury, rapine, and murder, could recur to no better expedients for its maintenance and ſupport. Terror therefore became "the order of the day;" the guillotine, "the miniſter of finance;" and the poſſeſſion of property, the harbinger of death. The tyranny, the ambition, the avarice, and the barbarity of the Jacobins were inſatiable; and "fraternity" was to effect for them in *other* countries what "liberty and equality" had done in their own; it was even to do more; for at the ſame time that it afforded ample gratification for their inordinate appetites, it gave a temporary ſtability to their government, which they could not by any other means have obtained, and diverted the popular enthuſiaſm to objects moſt favourable to their deſigns.

They were well aware that the origin of their power might in a very ſhort time become its deſtruction; and that a revolution would eaſily deſtroy the fragile fabric of inſurrection. Of this they were in continual dread: ſome whole provinces were in an actual ſtate of rebellion, and others

the ſurrounding rabble how they dare inſult a repreſentative of the people?—one of them repled, "You are, it is true, the repreſentative of the people; but we are your ſovereign, for we are the people."

were by no means unanimous in ſupporting their uſurpation. The moſt ſtaunch enemies of monarchy ſaw with jealous indignation the monopolizing influence of the capital, the unrivalled aſcendancy of the Jacobins, and the enterprizing ambition of Robeſpierre.—A cruſade for the propagation of "liberty, equality, and fraternity" to the neighbouring nations, and to Britain among the firſt, where emiſſaries had long been ſecretly and (as they had reaſon to think) ſucceſsfully employed, was the moſt effectual meaſure they could adopt. It was unqueſtionably the duty of a *free* Republic to diſpenſe to the ſurrounding nations the *bleſſings* of "liberty and equality." Monarchy, in whatever form, was an uſurpation on the rights of man.—The governments of Europe were *all* deſpotic and corrupt—Kings were "crowned ruffians," who ought to be indiſcriminately deſtroyed; * "*to be born to royalty was itſelf a crime deſerving death*;" with many other abſurdities of a ſimilar kind, were continually repeated by the Jacobins, and excited the moſt enthuſiaſtic ardour in the deluded and deeply injured people. Thus they were ſent forth by millions to ſpread

* Theſe expreſſions, with many no leſs inflammatory and ridiculous, were frequently made uſe of by the orators moſt celebrated in the national aſſembly at the latter end of the year 1792.

ſlaughter

ſlaughter and deſolation through the extenſive range of their deſtructive courſe; to drench their own fertile provinces with kindred blood, and to leave their country a prey to the tranſcendant atrocity of the moſt ruthleſs tyrants that ever ſcourged mankind. But have not the people of France, it may be aſked, an undoubted right to chooſe whatever form of government they thought fit, without conſulting the neighbouring powers?

Moſt certainly they have, provided the conſtitution they adopt does not interfere with the internal government, or with the rights of other nations. No other ſtate is authorized by the law of nations to queſtion the right of the people of France to deſtroy their ancient deſpotic monarchy. They had an equal right to form the conſtitution of 1789—an equal right (ſo far as it concerns all other nations) to deſtroy in 1792, the conſtitution they had ſolemnly ſworn on each anniverſary of its formation to maintain—an equal right (if it ſeemed good to them) to appoint delegates and hold their national aſſembly at Paris—an equal right to ſuffer that aſſembly to be overawed and governed by a lawleſs banditti, the *ſoi-diſant* ſovereign power of the people, though, in fact, the ſervile inſtruments of a faction—an equal right to give the ſanction of their tacit or implied aſſent

aſſent of every act of rapine and murder committed in their name—an equal right to celebrate the anniverſary of the infamous murder of their king as a triumphal feſtival—to convert the church of Notre Dame into a temple of reaſon—to eſtabliſh atheiſm—to canonize Marat and Robeſpierre—to make the 10th of Auguſt, and 2d of September, 1792, *red* letter days in the Sans Culotte Calendar—in fine, they had, and ſtill have, an unqueſtionable right to eſtabliſh and perpetuate in France that ſyſtem of "liberty and equality," which they now poſſeſs—becauſe, however unjuſt, immoral, inhuman, or abſurd their conduct in theſe, and various other inſtances may be, one independent nation is not accountable to another for the adminiſtration or eſtabliſhment of its internal government.

But when France, not content with forming a conſtitution for herſelf, added "*fraternity*" to "liberty and equality," ſhe violated the rights of every nation with whoſe internal government ſhe thus preſumed to interfere. To repel invaſion is a right founded on the immutable laws of nature and juſtice; and even to make repriſals, (though not ſo clearly deducible from theſe pure ſources), is admitted as a right by the law of nations; for this reaſon; that nations being independent of

each other, and there not being, as in ſeparate ſocieties, any court of law in which the injured party can ſeek redreſs and puniſh thoſe who do the wrong, they muſt vindicate their rights by force of arms, and attack the unjuſt aggreſſor where he is moſt vulnerable. Happy would it be for mankind, if it were poſſible for our nature to be ſo far meliorated, and our paſſions ſo much under the command of philoſophy, as to allow of the eſtabliſhment of ſuch a court of equity, among the civilized nations in the world, as might ſuperſede the dire neceſſity of *war*, and its concomitant horrors and crimes.

Millions of human beings, ſtrangers to each other, and much more inclined by nature to be friends than enemies, would not then be conveyed over land and ocean with peril, hardſhip, and diſeaſe for their conſtant attendants, and with the improvident ruinous expenſe to their different nations, for no other purpoſe than to deſtroy each other, that they may gratify the pride, avarice, or revenge of thoſe, who, perhaps, deride alike their ſufferings, and their folly!—Such, however, is the preſent imperfect ſtate of human affairs; and according to the abſurd and ſanguinary ſyſtem, by which the conduct of the moſt civilized nations toward each other is regulated, France was juſtified, not only

only in oppoſing the aggreſſion of the Emperor and the King of Pruſſia, but in attempting to carry the war into their own territories.

Thus an ambition more inordinate, a thirſt for power and conqueſt more inſatiable, a deſpotiſm more humiliating, more dangerous, and more intolerable than even that of Louis XIV. aſſumed the appearance of juſtice; and the people were at once inflamed by vindictive fury and enthuſiaſtic zeal.

Of a deſpotiſm, and ſentiments ſo favourable to their views, the Jacobins were not ſlow to avail themſelves; daily experience convincing them that no achievement is too daring, no conqueſt too hard, for thoſe who poſſeſs the conſummate art to blind the reaſon, and inflame the paſſions of the mind; to direct the reſiſtleſs operations of that paſſive ſlave of prejudice, and opinion, yet powerful agents in all political tranſactions, the will of the multitude.—This is the mighty engine which the deſpotic rulers of France have, from the commencement of the memorable revolution, but too ſucceſsfully employed, in promoting their moſt daring, moſt iniquitous, and, to thoſe who do not conſider the force of their *moving power*, moſt improbable deſigns.

The

The deſtruction of the Baſtile, of the nobility, of the monarchy, of religion, of all ſocial ſubordination, and of every moral principle, was not merely a revolution circumſcribed by the boundaries of France: it was a total revolution in the opinions, the manners, and the cuſtoms of a great and populous nation; its influence is pervading, progreſſive, and reſiſtleſs; but its vital principle, which is no other than the unaccountable mutability of the human mind, is unſubſtantial, and fleeting, as

"——the baſeleſs fabric of a viſion."

The Jacobins, exalted by this capricious power to the ſummit of their wiſhes, were confident that fraternity would gain for them in other nations equal advantages to thoſe which liberty and equality had procured for them in France; and that their united influence would extend their conqueſts and their power far beyond the wideſt limits to which the ambition of a ſingle deſpot ever preſumed to aſpire.

The war which we are moſt unhappily obliged to continue is a war of principles: not a war of the French Republic with the coaleſced powers, but of "liberty, equality, fraternity, and the

rights of man" (as defined by the Jacobins) with every form of government, and every ſyſtem of religion eſtabliſhed on earth.—On the part of France it is *bellum ad internecionem*; on that of the confederated powers, it is a war not merely of ſelf defence, but of ſelf preſervation.

To every country which has a government worth defending, a religion worth preſerving, a war with the conſtitution of France of the year 1792, was not a queſtion of expediency, policy, or juſtice, but of evident, inevitable neceſſity. Nor could the coercive force of this neceſſity be more powerfully impreſſive on any country than on Britain, ſince no other country poſſeſſed ſo excellent a conſtitution of government, united with ſo rational an eſtabliſhment, or ſo ample a toleration of religion. The war which is unavoidable cannot be unjuſt; and to thoſe who are convinced no alternative was left for Britain, but to reſign its government, its liberty, its property, or to maintain theſe ineſtimable privileges by force of arms, the juſtice of the war cannot be a matter of doubt; however ſincerely every friend to his country, and to the human race, muſt lament its dire neceſſity.

It is not with France as a nation that Britain is now at war; and happy would it have been for both countries, had not petulance, arrogance, ambition, or a weak impolitic acquiescence with popular prejudice and resentment, plunged them into * three wars equally ruinous to themselves, and destructive to mankind, for objects so unimportant as to be nearly ridiculous. Far different are the causes and objects of the present momentous contest, in which the question at issue is no less than the maintenance or disorganization of civil society. The subversion of the existing governments was the avowed object, the animating principle of that military despotism which the governing faction in France thought proper to call the constitution of 1792. Pure democracies, of a similar construction, were to be universally established—monarchy under any form was declared to be tyranny—a violation of the imprescriptible rights of man; hereditary honours and titles were impositions no less ridiculous than intolerable—and the possession of private property

* The Spanish war of 1738, in which France engaged first as an ally, and afterwards as a principal, originated in the loss of Capt. Jenkins's ear.—The war of 1756, was, as Mr. Voltaire pointedly remarks, "a quarrel for a few acres of snow in Canada."—and the American war took its rise from a litigated tax of 1*s.* 6*d.* per lb. on tea.

was inconſiſtent with liberty and equality. "Theſe "(ſaid the Jacobins) are the only true principles "of government; and theſe it is our duty, our "intereſt, and our determination, not only to "maintain, but to diſſeminate. We have not "the moſt diſtant idea of *conqueſt*; it is not for "this our triumphant banners are diſplayed in "Belgium, in Holland, in Germany, and in "Italy; it is not with the oppreſſed people of "theſe countries we are at war; they are our "brethren; we therefore invite *them* to fraternize "with us, and, like us, to extirpate the tyrants "and the tyranny they have too long groaned "under."

Democratic tyranny thus erected a tottering throne on the ancient, but unſtable, foundation of force and fraud.* Invigorated by the additional ſupport it derived from a ſpirit of popular enthuſiaſm, more ardent, and far more univerſal,

* Democratic tyranny always ſeeks ſupport from popular deluſion, united with military force, as monarchical deſpotiſm does from the union of the ſame force with ancient cuſtom or prerogative.

Of the former tyranny, and of its *fleeting* duration the hiſtories of Greece and Rome (and of England during the laſt century) afford remarkable examples.

than

than religious fanaticiſm ever excited; it graſped its iron ſceptre, eager to exerciſe that ſupreme command, to eſtabliſh that dictatorial aſcendency over Europe, which have always been the darling objects of France, and which her hypocritical demagogues not only taught her to believe, but might probably be vain enough themſelves to imagine, ſhe would aſſuredly acquire and retain.

The all-wiſe Governor of the univerſe is continually producing good from evil: ſometimes counteracting the moſt deep laid plans of human iniquity by the intervention of cauſes equally unforeſeen and irreſiſtible; and frequently converting the moſt malignant, cruel, and ſordid paſſions in the heart of man to the ſervice of oppoſite virtues.

Thus the reciprocal miſeries of this deſolating war may, when the dreadful ſtorm is paſt, excite in the breaſts of thoſe who now meet only to deſtroy, thoſe ſentiments of philanthropy which are congenial to our nature.—The rant of pretended zealots, who in ſecret deride the patriotiſm they profeſs, whoſe ſole aim is to violate thoſe rights, to deſtroy that freedom they pretend to revere, may prove eſſentially beneficial to the liberties of mankind.

The

The indiſcriminate fury of Jacobin fanaticiſm, which confounds monarchy with tyranny, and aſſails alike the benefactors and the plunderers of nations, as it has awakened, may perpetuate, popular reſentment againſt ambition, rapine, and deſpotiſm, under whatever form they may appear.

To future ages, perhaps even to this, the revolution itſelf, dreadful as are its preſent effects, menacing as its aſpect now appears, may be productive of ineſtimable benefits. It may accelerate and extend the progreſs of liberty, philoſophy, and civilization; it may inform, correct, and harmonize mankind.

Already its meliorating influence produces great and viſible alterations in our conduct as well as in our opinions. Superſtition drops its maſk, and perſecution its ſcourge; pride, terrified and abaſed, relaxes its haughty brow; rank, birth, and title, are appreciated by the ſtandard of reaſon; and the fortuitous occupier of theſe neceſſary appendages to civil ſociety muſt no longer claim from others that reſpect for his ſtation which he neglects to pay it himſelf; he muſt alſo bear in mind, that the moſt dangerous and the worſt of levellers in ſociety are thoſe who degrade the ſtation to which fortune has raiſed them;

them; who lower the eminence on which they erect the ſtandard of their pride; and abet the cauſe of that equality they affect to depreciate and deſpiſe, making the neceſſity of ſubordination grievous, and ſubmiſſion to vice, arrogance, and folly, diſgraceful.

How pointed, yet how juſt, is the contempt with which reaſon and philoſophy now regard the famed exploits, the rapine, the murders, the inſatiable pride and ambition of that "crowned "ruffian" of antiquity, Alexander the Great! They may now give a bold and deciſive anſwer in the affirmative to the queſtion of the humane, indignant poet,

"And ſhall not twice a thouſand years unpraiſe
"The boiſterous boy, and blaſt his guilty bays?"
Dr. YOUNG's *Love of Fame.*

His valour, his occaſional magnanimity, his noble confidence, may ſtill be admired; but his exceſſes, his pride, and his tyranny, will, in this enlightened age, meet with the deteſtation they deſerve.

How deſpicable, how ſordid, how abject, does the ſanguinary ambition of Louis XIV. appear!

How

How does it ſhrink from the mortifying compariſon with the invincible Grecian Hero!

No ſprig of laurel graced the brow—no genius informed—no virtue irradiated the mind of the gloomy ferocious bigot.

The haughty unrelenting deſpot compelled armies of ſlaves to ſacrifice their lives in the unjuſt and unavailing attempt to ſwell his triumphs, and extend his ſway. Rioting in luxury and debauchery, or chanting, with impious hypocriſy, Te Deums for battles he dared not fight, and for victories he did not obtain, he ſaw Europe's fertile plains deſolated and drenched with blood at his command; while the indignant, agonizing, awful groan of ſuffering millions aſcended to heaven, to call down vengeance on his guilty head.

Nor was the tremendous appeal preferred in vain; baffled, abaſed, and vanquiſhed, enraged by diſappointment, and afflicted with an incurable diſeaſe, the wretched Louis cloſed a life of infamy with anguiſh, remorſe, and diſmay.

"Ill weared ambition, how much art thou ſhrunk!
"Are all the trophies, glories, triumphs, toils,
"Sunk to this little meaſure?"

SHAKESPEARE.

The

The open, daring arrogance of regal tyranny, armed for plunder and devaſtation, however odious and revolting to reaſon and humanity, dazzles by its terrific ſplendor. The ſtern, majeſtic, intrepid hero, ſcorning diſguiſe,

" Aſſumes the port of Mars, and at his heels,
" Leaſh'd in like hounds, ſee Famine, Sword, and Fire,
" Crouch for employment."

SHAKESPEARE.

Not ſo the mean, plebeian, *ſans culotte* tyranny, of Jacobin extraction. It takes a ſecret, treacherous, " ſerpent courſe ;" like the fabled Proteus, borrows the form moſt ſuited to its purpoſe, and thinks none too vile that can gratify its ambition, ſatiate its avarice, or glut its vengeance. Sometimes it apes the ſly, inſidious hypocrite, preaching to the gaping multitude the new political *revelation* of liberty, equality, and the " rights " of man ;" while " the ſlow and moving " finger" of deriſion points indignantly at the ſupercilious ariſtocrat, the lazy, pampered prelate, the rich, luxurious merchant ; then turns ſignificantly to their palaces, their churches, and their wealth ; extols the wiſdom and the juſtice of Agrarian laws : the righteouſneſs of bleſſed " equality," rouſes the ſportſmen, fires the hungry

 pack,

pack, and hunts the ill-fated victims to the toils of their deſtroyers.

The varying monſter, through every changing form retaining his innate depravity, now, perhaps, appears the zealous champion of his country's cauſe, and injured freedom's rights, aſcends the tribune, echos the hollow murmurs of the dreadful "Mountain,"

"Bellows out for Rome and for his country,
"And mouths at Cæſar till he ſhakes the Senate."

ADDISON.

Again he quits his fleeting form, and heads, perhaps, the furious hordes of frantic republicans, deaf to the voice of ſuffering humanity, and eager to ſpread terror and deſtruction through their native land.

The mother's piercing ſhriek, the infant's feeble cry, awake no pity in the tyrant's breaſt; his command is gone forth—all royaliſts muſt die—whole provinces muſt be depopulated—and deſolation muſt be accounted victory.*

* Ubi ſolitudinem faciunt, pacem vocant.

Such were the bloody triumphs of the hero of La Vendée, the bold, vaunting invader of Ireland.

Sated

Sated for a while with ſlaughter, he becomes the director of feſtivals and orations—the compoſer of martial airs, and "pious orgies," in honour of "*his* gods,"—the arbiter of taſte and faſhion—the ſage philoſopher, legiſlator, and chronologer, deſtined to enlighten and emancipate a ſtupid, ſlaviſh world—to eradicate the ancient hereditary, vulgar errors, of chaſtity, virtue, and morality; and to extinguiſh the very name and memory of Chriſtianity.*

Again the direful tocſin ſounds—the affrighted capital re-echos the roar of cannon—the ſhrieks of death, and the ſhouts of triumphant, frantic rage! The *many-headed* monſter now aſſumes its *native ſhape*, aſcends its ſanguine throne,

"Rides in the whirlwind, and directs the ſtorm."

Prodigal of blood, it has even been known ſome times to deviate into the path of juſtice, and ſhed its own. The heads of tyrants have paſſed in quick ſucceſſion under its guillotine, while the deathleſs hydra has ſtill ſurvived, and gained new vigour from its bleeding wounds.

* The *deification* of reaſon, and even of mortals!—the laws of divorce—and the new calendar, were moſt undoubtedly inſtituted for theſe purpoſes.

Vain and endleſs would be the purſuit of this illuſive Proteus, through its various evaneſcent forms; but the moſt important change, that which, while it confirmed his domeſtic tyranny, extended his foreign conqueſts, was the metamorphoſis into that ſleek, baſe, cringing, cruel hypocrite, which calls itſelf FRATERNITY—which deceives the ſurrounding nations with the ſemblance of liberty, and the chimera of equality—that cowardly aſſaſſin, which

" *Hugs while it ſtabs, and ſmiles while it devours."

If this is a juſt eſtimate, and if it pourtrays a faithful repreſentation of the principles and conduct of the faction which governed France, from the depoſition of the King, and the ſubverſion of the conſtitution of 1789, till the end of the year 1793; and which, even till the eſtabliſhment of the preſent conſtitution, exhibited very equivocal ſymptoms of amendment; it will not, be very difficult to accompliſh the objects of this diſcuſſion, which are,

1ſt, To exculpate the Britiſh government and nation from the foul imputation of unjuſtly provoking a war, into which they were reluctantly compelled to engage.

* Hugging and kiſſing have frequently preceded aſſaſſination.

2dly,

2dly, To point out the impolicy of receiving M. Chauvelin as ambaſſador from the republic of France, in the beginning of the year 1793; and to vindicate the ſincerity of adminiſtration in the late negotiation for peace.

3dly, To recommend the immediate termination of this deſtructive war by a general peace, on the baſis of compenſation, which has been admitted by the governments of France and Britain to be juſt, and to render this peace permanent and ſecure by a firm alliance between the French and Britiſh nations and governments.

Theſe articles will be ſeparately conſidered in the following ſection.

END OF SECTION THE FIRST.

SEC-

SECTION SECOND.

THE heavy charge, that the Britiſh government precipitated this country into an unjuſt and unneceſſary war with France, though repeatedly urged, not only by the anarchiſts of that nation, and the inſtigators of ſedition and revolution in this, but by many elevated in ſtation, reſpectable for integrity, and eminent in ability, has never been ſubſtantiated by evidence, nor corroborated by arguments, which will bear the teſt of impartial diſcuſſion.

It was not againſt France, as a nation, nor even againſt the Jacobins, unjuſtly exerciſing an uſurped power in that nation, that the Britiſh government took up arms.

The tyranny of theſe democratic impoſtors might have excited our abhorrence; the miſeries of their victims muſt have claimed our compaſſion; and the blind credulity of their adherents might have raiſed our wonder: but the crimes committed, and the calamities endured

by France, could not have juſtified our interference, if their conſequences had not extended to ourſelves.

It is not becauſe their government is oppreſſive, and their governors tyrannical, but becauſe the principles upon which that government is founded are incompatible with the exiſtence of our own, that we are at war with them.

It is not on our part a war of aggreſſion, but of ſelf defence; a war which no expedient could have prevented, which abſolutely precluded any poſſibility of compromiſe, while thoſe principles were explicitly avowed, and ſyſtematically reduced to practice.

Long before the death of Louis XVI. the Jacobin faction had inſidiouſly attempted to undermine a conſtitution of government, which, when they obtained the full poſſeſſion of unlimited power, they openly declared it was their intention to ſubvert.

Our excellent conſtitution was at once an object of envy, hatred, and fear, to this proud, monopolizing, ambitious oligarchy.

They

They envied the wealth, they hated the liberty, they feared the power which Britain derived from this conſtitution; and, juſtly conſidering, that, while the Britiſh government poſſeſſed the confidence of the people, it would oppoſe an inſuperable obſtacle to their long projected ſcheme of univerſal empire, they omitted no means which fraud could ſuggeſt, treachery could execute, or chance might offer, to weaken a confidence, and divide a force, with which they were unable, when united, to contend.

Fortune on this occaſion ſeemed moſt propitious to their deſires, by ſupplying, without even an effort, on their part, of genius or invention, the moſt apt means for inſtilling into the minds of the populace their diſorganizing, levelling principles of equality; their inſidious offers of revolutionary fraternity; and furniſhed them, at the ſame time, with the moſt convenient vehicle, and the moſt plauſible pretexts, for diſſeminating their fallacious and moſt pernicious doctrines through the different provinces of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Correſponding ſocieties had been eſtabliſhed in London, and in different parts of Great Britain, for the purpoſe of procuring, by ſuch juſt and legal means as the conſtitution not merely allowed, but appeared to many among

among the moſt reſpectable characters, both in and out of Parliament, ſtrictly to enjoin a radical reform in the vitiated and inadequate repreſentation of the people in the Houſe of Commons.

They looked on this as an evil which "had "increaſed, was increaſing, and ought to be di-"miniſhed."

It could not poſſibly have been foreſeen, or even conjectured, at the time theſe real friends to liberty and the Britiſh conſtitution inſtituted the correſponding ſocieties for parliamentary reform, that they would become the moſt dangerous engines of hoſtility to that conſtitution, of deſtruction to that liberty, they were conſtructed to defend. Still leſs probable was it that the mighty powers of this engine ſhould be uſurped, augmented, and directed by the moſt ſubtle, indefatigable, and inveterate enemy the Engliſh nation ever had cauſe to fear.

Yet all theſe moſt extraordinary events we have lived to witneſs.

We have ſeen numerous correſponding ſocieties, inſtituted, as they pretend, for the purpoſe of promoting parliamentary reform, under the immedi-

ate influence of the Jacobin faction in France, or of Britiſh ſubjects equally deſperate and unprincipled, and, if poſſible, ſtill more criminal.

We have ſeen them moſt diſgracefully and ſervily ape the abſurd appellations, the brutal manners, and the diſguſting cant of their employers, and, under the maſk of liberty and equality, attempting to betray the unſuſpecting populace into ſedition, inſurrection, and rebellion.

The preſidents and orators of theſe "political brothels" wanted neither natural abilities nor legal information. They knew how far they might proceed to provoke proſecution, and where they muſt ſtop to eſcape conviction; it even ſeemed as if every new trial, while it improved their knowledge by experience, ſubſtracted from that of their opponents; as if each recent accuſation was to increaſe the triumph of faction and the diſcomfiture of government, by an additional acquittal.

Thoſe who aſcribe theſe acquittals to the miſtaken lenity or wilful partiality of the jurors, and lament the injury which the conſtitution has ſuſtained by them, appear, in both theſe opinions, to be greatly miſtaken.

It

It was evidently clear, from the event of the firſt trial, and the aſtoniſhing diſplay of ability, eloquence, and legal information, which it called forth on both ſides of the queſtion, that the priſoners, though acquitted of treaſon, were indebted much more to their proſecutors than to the jury for their diſcharge.

Had the ſubſequent charges been lighter, they would probably have ended in conviction and condign puniſhment; and the weight of the accuſation, or of the puniſhment, would not have preponderated that of the crime.

Yet, notwithſtanding the priſoners who were acquitted had reaſon to congratulate themſelves on their fortunate eſcape, and their employers were gratified with an imaginary victory, the event of theſe trials was not only a cauſe of triumph to the friends of that palladium of our conſtitution, *trial by juries*, but to government itſelf; for the body of evidence adduced at theſe trials clearly demonſtrating the *intimate* connection and *cloſe correſpondence* that ſubſiſted between the correſponding ſocieties and the ruling faction in France, excited, among all ranks and degrees of people in the three kingdoms, a ſpirit of zeal for the Britiſh conſtitution ſo ardent, and an ab-

horrence of the treacherous deſigns of its foreign and domeſtic enemies ſo general, and ſo juſt, as to produce, early in the year 1793, counter-aſſociations ſufficiently numerous, reſpectable, and loyal, to arreſt in its full career the dangerous progreſs of inſurrection.*

There

* If theſe correſponding ſocieties, formed on the model of thoſe reſpectable aſſociations for the purpoſe of effecting, by conſtitutional meaſures, a reform in the repreſentation of the people, really intended nothing more, why did they take ſo active and decided a part in the internal affairs of France, as to correſpond with the moſt inveterate enemies of all monarchical forms of government?

Why did they, on all occaſions of their meeting, applaud the principles, adopt the practice, and congratulate the ſucceſs, of the republicans and levellers of France? Why did they even vote them money, and aſſure them of their zealous attachment and concurrence?

Why did theſe ſocieties, inſtituted, as they pretended, for the ſole purpoſe of promoting, by legal meaſures, a parliamentary reform, circulate with ſuch unwearied aſſiduity, and ſuch ample diſſemination of its levelling and pernicious principles, Mr. Paine's "Rights of Man," which ridicules the idea of the Britiſh conſtitution, denies its exiſtence, and repreſents our whole ſyſtem of government as a villainous combination of folly, impoſture, and tyranny?

And finally, why ſhould parliamentary reformers thus countenance principles hoſtile to the exiſtence of parliament,

There may not be wanting many to whom theſe laudable and conſtitutional aſſociations in defence, not only of government, but of every privilege it ſecures to its ſubjects, may appear a mere miniſterial manœuvre; and there are undoubtedly ſtill greater numbers who apply the *vice verſa* argument to the correſponding ſocieties and the oppoſition. Should it be granted that both thoſe concluſions were juſt, what would be the conſequence but that the oppoſition were completely foiled at their own weapons.

But to the candid, unprejudiced eye of reaſon the conteſt will appear to have been between the

and ſanction a work which has ſince been declared to be a libel by the verdict of an Engliſh jury?

This work of Mr. Paine, and the celebrated publication of Mr. Burke, to which it was conſidered as an anſwer, form the ſubject of a tract which I wrote ſoon after their appearances; but which is ſtill in MS. and may hereafter be printed, if the preſent eſſay ſhould be favourably received by the public. I ſhall, therefore, forbear to ſay more of them on the preſent occaſion, than that they are both ſtrongly expreſſive of the characters, the genius, and the principles of their authors; and that they appear to be far better calculated to eſtabliſh the prejudices and opinions of their reſpective parties than to alter thoſe of their opponents; more adapted to confirm the perſeverance in *error*, than to advance the cauſe of TRUTH.

friends

friends and enemies of the Britiſh conſtitution, who each made their appeal to the ſenſe of the people; and that the victory of government over anarchy was the triumph of liberty.

Be this as it may, the inſidious interference of the Jacobin faction with the internal government of this country, which at that time was in a ſtate of neutrality, was a manifeſt infraction of the laws of nations, an unprovoked and moſt unjuſt aggreſſion.

Yet it was not till this faction had uſurped the ſovereignty of France, under the denomination of a republic, by the conſtitution of 1792; till it had, by opening the Scheldt, violated the treaty which the Britiſh government was bound to maintain; till it had by a *ſolemn oath* pledged itſelf to deſtroy all kings, and baniſh monarchy from Europe; till it had paſſed a decree, offering its aſſiſtance to the people of all countries in the ſubverſion of their eſtabliſhed forms of government, which theſe univerſal legiſlators ſtiled uſurpations inconſiſtent with liberty, equality, and the rights of man; that Britain reluctantly departed from the ſyſtem of neutrality ſhe was no longer permitted to maintain.

Com-

Compelled, not only by acts of aggreſſion equally unjuſt and unprovoked, but by the univerſal law of ſelf-defence, to ward off the mortal blow which was aimed at her exiſtence as an independent nation by the memorable degree of fraternity of the 19th November, 1792, no alternative was left to the Britiſh government but to oppoſe its operation by force of arms. *See Note*, p. 61.

To the allegation, that the object of the war in which Britain engaged in alliance with the coaleſced powers to re-eſtabliſh monarchy in France was unjuſt, becauſe France, as an independent nation, had an undoubted right to eſtabliſh for herſelf whatever form of government ſhe thought proper, it is ſufficient to anſwer, that France had no right to frame a conſtitution for herſelf, the fundamental principle of which was the ſubverſion of all other governments; that ſhe had no right to call in queſtion the juſtice or legality of thoſe governments on account of their non-conformity to her ideas of liberty and equality.

Had the ſelf-conſtituted government of France been in every reſpect, but its diſorganiſing principles, the reverſe of what it was, the avowal of thoſe principles, and its open as well as covert attempts

tempts to ſubvert the Britiſh government would not only have juſtified reſiſtance as a right, but enjoined it as a duty.

It was not the government of England, but of France, that referred to the dreadful deciſion of arms the momentous queſtion—"Whether the "former was to be reduced to the humiliating "ſtate of a ſubordinate republic, or the latter to "be again a monarchy?"

And what kind of government was this which Britons were arrogantly commanded to exchange for their own? Was it not the ſanguinary conſtitution of France in 1792, the reign of terror eſtabliſhed by regicide, maſſacres, and perjury, nouriſhed by the plunders of nations, and upheld by the point of the bayonet?

But granting all this, and much more, to be incontrovertible fact; admitting that whole provinces of France preferred death to ſo abject a ſlavery, and that thoſe which ſubmitted were either deprived of all power to reſiſt by depopulating requiſitions, or deceived by their own enthuſiaſm, and the hopes of conqueſt and plunder, did not this government offer to treat with us? Ought not adminiſtration to have heard what terms

terms they would propoſe? Should they not have received M. Chauvelin as ambaſſador from the republic of France?

This leads to the ſecond article of diſcuſſion: viz. "To point out the impolicy of receiving "M. Chauvelin in the character of ambaſſador "from the republic of France, in the beginning "of the year 1793; and to vindicate the ſince-"rity of government in the late negotiation for "peace."

The miniſter on that, as on every ſubſequent occaſion, when the expediency and even neceſſity of making peace has been inſiſted on, has uniformly declared his ſincere deſire "to treat for "peace, on fair and honourable terms; when-"ever France ſhall be in poſſeſſion of a govern-"ment that is capable of maintaining the accuſ-"tomed treaties of amity with other nations." This declaration is equally candid and explicit; nor has there occurred any event ſince it was made that can in the leaſt degree impeach its ſincerity.

But where is the advocate for peace, or the opponent of adminiſtration, hardy enough to maintain, that the government which ſent Monſ. Chauvelin poſſeſſed any *one* quality which could render it capable of "maintaining the accuſ-

" tomed treaties of amity with the neighbouring " nations ?"

Did it not exhibit to the whole world a convincing proof of its *inability* to comply with this neceſſary preliminary in every prominent, diſguſting feature ? Did not the only principles to which it endeavoured to adhere, the preſervation of its exiſtence, and the extenſion of its power, alike forbid it to entertain the moſt diſtant idea of peace, which muſt have been inevitably deſtructive to both ? War was its animating principle; rapine and conqueſt, its vital ſupport.

But though the embaſſy of M. Chauvelin could not have peace for its real object, it had others leſs oſtenſible, but of conſiderable importance, to accompliſh by his miſſion. By receiving Monſ. Chauvelin in the character of an ambaſſador, the Britiſh government would explicitly acknowledge their's. By rejecting the proffered explanation, they would incur the odium of plunging their country into a war which they might have avoided; and, by thus furniſhing a plauſible argument for their opponents, would increaſe the number of the diſaffected, and ſtrengthen the cauſe of ſedition at home, while the ſame arguments would produce in France effects greatly advantageous to the Jacobin cauſe.

But

But had adminiſtration adopted the impolitic meaſure of receiving M. Chauvelin in the character of an ambaſſador from the French republic (the only one in which he had any power to negotiate), he muſt, if he had ſpoken the real ſentiments of thoſe he repreſented, and at the ſame time adopted their ſtyle, have ſpoken nearly in the following terms:

" Imagine not, corrupt miniſters of a totter-
" ing throne, it is to you, or to the tyranny you
" ſervilely obey, and fully attempt to perpetuate,
" that the free and invincible republic of France
" ſends me as ambaſſador. Think you they will
" condeſcend to ſue for peace to a ——, who
" deſerves to die for preſuming to wear a crown?
" With an ariſtocracy, whom they deteſt as the
" privileged, hereditary plunderers of ſociety?
" With a P——t, that is the ſhadow of repre-
" ſentation, and the very eſſence of corruption?—
" No! Frenchmen will be true to their engage-
" ments; that glorious republic, which has ſworn
" eternal hatred and deſtruction to kings, will
" fulfil its ſolemn engagement. The hated go-
" vernment of Britain ſhall be deſtroyed; the
" tricoloured flag ſhall fly on the Tower of
" London; and the tree of liberty ſhall be planted
" at the gates of St. James's Palace; it ſhall be

" nouriſhed by the blood of tyrants. It is to you, " virtuous Britons, who know how to appreciate, " and are alone worthy to receive, that liberty " and equality we have eſtabliſhed in France, " that my embaſſy is in reality addreſſed. I offer " in one comprehenſive word all the bleſſings " France enjoys: I offer you ' Fraternity.'— " Peace muſt of courſe be the reſult of the fall of " that tyranny you have endured too long; and " it only remains for you to determine whether " you will form a member of the invincible re- " public of France, ' one and indiviſible," or " become a republic on the ſame model, though " proportionate to your ſubordinate rank in the " ſcale of nations."

Equally ridiculous were the ſentiments, equally inſolent the language, not only of the Jacobins, but of the Briſſotine faction, at the very time M. Chauvelin was ſent to England as ambaſſador from the republic to treat of peace. But what was this republic which the Britiſh government was required, as a preliminary article, to acknowledge? Was it the republic of the Briſſotines—of the Jacobins—or of Robeſpierre?

No man will be ſo regardleſs of truth and reaſon as to ſay it was the republic of France. Britain

tain would indeed have proved herſelf (what ſhe never ought to be) the implacable enemy of France, had ſhe recogniſed, as a free republic, the uſurpation of thoſe ſanguinary tyrants, by whom France has been deluded, depopulated, and enſlaved. But admitting that *endurance* was *election*; that the convulſive tyranny of contending factions, to which France was, from inability of reſiſtance, reluctantly compelled to ſubmit, was the object of her choice; and, in reality, what it pretended to call itſelf, a free republic; ſtill it was not a government "capable of maintaining "the accuſtomed treaties of amity with neigh- "bouring nations;" it poſſeſſed not ſtability to enſure its continuance for a ſingle week—it poſ- ſeſſed not integrity to fulfil any engagement, ſince it was founded on perjury—it had ſworn eternal enmity and deſtruction to kings—and its decree was *unrepealed* when it ſent an ambaſſador to treat for peace with the government it had bound itſelf to deſtroy.*

Yet

* What is called by the French government the explanation of this decree, given in their name by M. Chauvelin, in January 1793, when he preſented his letters of credence, can only be regarded as an additional proof of their duplicity. Theſe are their words: "We have ſaid, and we deſire to "repeat it, that the decree of the 19th November could not "have

Yet had not thoſe inſuperable difficulties been oppoſed to the admiſſion of M. Chauvelin's embaſſy, could the Britiſh government have conſented to a *ſeparate* peace with the French republic?

" have any application, unleſs to the ſingle caſe in which the " general will of a nation, clearly and unequivocally ex- " preſſed, ſhould call the French nation to its aſſiſtance and " fraternity. Sedition can never be conſtrued into the gene- " ral will: theſe two ideas naturally repel each other, ſince " a ſedition is not, and cannot be, any other than the move- " ment of a ſmall number againſt the nation at large; and " the movement would ceaſe to be ſeditious provided all the " members of a ſociety ſhould at once riſe, either to correct " their government, or to change its form *in toto*, or for any " other object." So that, according to this explanation, the decree was not meant to have any operation " till the general " will of a nation clearly and unequivocally expreſſed ſhould " call the French nation to its aſſiſtance and fraternity; till " all the members of a ſociety ſhould riſe at once, &c." or, in other words, it only offered aſſiſtance and fraternity in a caſe where no aſſiſtance could be wanted. " For when a ſociety " riſes at once either to correct its government, or to change " its form *in toto*, or for any other purpoſe," it cannot want aſſiſtance from other nations, ſince it is fully competent of itſelf to effect its purpoſe.

The decree of the 19th November (thus *explained*) muſt undoubtedly be admitted to be at once the moſt harmleſs, and the moſt unmeaning decree that ever was paſſed—but unfortunately for thoſe countries that have received the " aſſiſtance and fraternity of the French republic," they have found

lic? Muſt ſhe not, in that caſe, have given up her continental treaties, abandoned her allies, *diſarmed her navy*, and after having been a tame, inglorious ſpectator of the conqueſt of Europe, by the numerous and reſiſtleſs armies of France, have ſeen thoſe armies, amounting to more than a million of men, fluſhed with victory, pouring their overwhelming torrent on the wide-extended, defenceleſs coaſts of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and involving all in univerſal ruin?

The moſt diſaſtrous war would undoubtedly be preferable to ſo infamous, ſo deſtructive a peace. It was not till the eſtabliſhment of the preſent government in France, by the conſtitution of 1795, nor till that conſtitution, by obtaining the confidence of the French nation, had acquired ſtability capable of maintaining "the accuſtomed treaties "of amity with the neighbouring nations," that a faint, though diſtant proſpect, appeared for the accompliſhment of that moſt deſirable event, a general and ſolid peace. Nor was it till the tide of victory was turned in favour of the Auſtrians

found them to be a combination of all the evils, and all the injuries, which ſuffering humanity can ſuſtain, or ruthleſs tyranny can inflict. So widely in this inſtance, at leaſt, does practice, illuſtrated by melancholy and unqueſtionable facts, vary from principles thus falſely and ſophiſtically explained.

in

in Germany, in the laſt campaign, by the brilliant and glorious exploits of Prince Charles, that any hopes could reaſonably be entertained of concluding a general peace.

The reſtoration of France from a ſtate of barbariſm and tyranny, unexampled in the annals of the civilized ages and countries of Europe, to the poſſeſſion of a conſiſtent, organized form of government, which has afforded many proofs of its regard to juſtice, morality, humanity, and the public good, which, it is to be hoped, may be in a ſtate of progreſſive improvement, and which *is* "capable of maintaining the accuſtomed treaties "of amity with neighbouring nations," coinciding with the happy turn and promiſing aſpect of the Emperor's affairs in Germany, formed a favourable juncture for negotiation.

This opportunity was not neglected by the Britiſh government; and though their overtures, by means of Mr. Wickham, did not meet with the deſired ſucceſs, the Directory were at length induced to declare their readineſs to accept an "accredited ambaſſador."

The embaſſy of Lord Malmeſbury was the conſequence; and throughout the whole of this

memorable tranſaction there appears, on the part of the Britiſh government, and of their ambaſſador, a ſpirit of candour, moderation, and forbearance, which might have produced the moſt happy conſequences to Europe, had the ſame *conciliatory* diſpoſition influenced the conduct of the Directory.

But, unhappily, it was ſo far the reverſe, that it appeared as if their only intention in receiving our ambaſſador was to gain, by ſo ungenerous a ſtratagem, the acknowledgement of their government, the oſtenſible object for which it was pretended they took up arms.

From the day of Lord Malmeſbury's arriva in France to that of his quitting it, he experienced from the *people* every poſſible teſtimony of reſpect —from the Directory, a regular, uninterrupted ſeries of inſult, arrogance, and mortification. They permitted, if they did not direct, the moſt ſcurrilous and indecent reflections on himſelf, his embaſſy, and the government he repreſented, to appear in a daily print,* under their immediate influence, and even in their pay.

* Le Redacteur.

The meanneſs of diſavowing what they thus openly ſanctioned, muſt render them contemptible, not only in the general opinion of the world, but in that of France itſelf; and at the ſame time it affords the ſtrongeſt proof that the duplicity with which they conſtantly charged the Britiſh adminiſtration, was clearly imputable to themſelves.

Every circumſtance attending this negotiation is a proof of their inſincerity. The war was undertaken to eſtabliſh the French republic; it is acknowledged by the embaſſy itſelf; all ideas of conqueſt they have repeatedly reprobated: yet an adjuſtment of the balance of acquiſitions, between Britain and France, arreſts the treaty in its progreſs, and is judged by the Directory a ſufficient excuſe for its inſolent diſmiſſion of the Britiſh ambaſſador, without ſo much as a hearing. At the very time they pretended to treat with our government for a general peace, they had actually ſent an ambaſſador to the Emperor to treat for a ſeparate peace, and it appeared as if Lord Malmeſbury was only detained till General Hoche had delivered his fraternal credentials as ambaſſador from the Directory to the Iriſh nation; ſince his departure from France preceded that of Lord Malmeſbury only five days.

The

The moſt ſcandalous and ridiculous commemoration of the anniverſary of the murder of Louis the Sixteenth, and the inhuman and impious mockery of ſwearing eternal hatred to kings, is an additional proof of the inſincerity of the Directory in the late negotiation.

The Meſſage of the King to Parliament on the 26th December, and his declaration on the 29th of the ſame month, equally demonſtrate the ſincerity of government in the late negotiation, and their anxious deſire to renew it.

But till the hoſtile principles, which, at preſent, fatally influence the counſels of the government of France be totally abandoned, and explicitly diſavowed, this deſirable object cannot be accompliſhed. The dread which the French government entertain of recalling their numerous armies is, perhaps, a much ſtronger inducement to them to continue the war than their deſire of conqueſt, their antipathy to the Britiſh government, or any difficulties, however great, which may attend the ſettlement of a general peace.

But are there no means to remove this obſtacle, and to quiet theſe apprehenſions?

This important queſtion leads to the third and laſt article intended to be conſidered in the preſent diſcuſſion.

Viz. 3dly, " To recommend the immediate " termination of this deſtructive war by a general " peace, on the baſis of compenſation, which " has been admitted by the governments of " Britain and France to be juſt; and to render " this peace permanent and ſecure, by a firm " alliance between the French and Britiſh nations " and governments."

As an indiſpenſable preliminary to the accompliſhment of this truly great and deſirable event, the reciprocal injuries which each of theſe powerful nations have ſuffered and inflicted, in their impolitic and ruinous contentions, muſt be buried in eternal oblivion; the abſurd national prejudices and antipathies, which the ambition of their governments, rather than the diſpoſitions of the inhabitants of theſe rival nations, have induſtriouſly propagated, muſt be abandoned; the hereditary enmity which has ſubſiſted for ſo many centuries muſt be forgotten.

Nor is this neceſſary revolution in popular opinion ſo difficult as it may at firſt ſight appear.

The

The aggregate maſs which is called *the people*, whether in France or in England (which are undoubtedly the moſt enlightened nations in the world) have neither opportunity nor inclination, if they *all* poſſeſſed ability, to form juſt or liberal ideas of the character of other nations; they are therefore always ready and willing to believe what is told them by thoſe whom they know to have more leiſure and better means of information than themſelves.

Engliſhmen and Frenchmen have, ever ſince the Norman conqueſt, been told they are *natural* enemies. This groſs libel on nature they have always conſidered as an article of their political creed; and have very conſcientiouſly, and willingly, followed their leaders to cut each other's throats, for the glory of their reſpective kings and countries; and to *revenge* themſelves on their "natural enemies," though all the time without any "malice or hatred in their hearts," except what their wiſe and righteous "governors, "teachers, political paſtors, and maſters," might have found it convenient to inſtil into them.

If two numerous armies of theſe natural enemies ſhould even, at this moment, when the national

animoſity created by ambition, nurſed by prejudice, and ſtrengthened by a long reciprocation of injuries, has attained its higheſt pitch, be eagerly waiting the dreadful event of battle; and if the meditated ſlaughter ſhould be ſuddenly and unexpectedly ſuſpended by the happy tidings of peace, would not the joyful acclamations of either hoſt aſſert the rights of injured nature? Her children, liberated from the cruel tyranny of human reſtrictions, and abſolved from the ſtern commands of honour, would obey her awful voice, and embrace as brethren.

A *natural* enemy "is a monſter" which the world "ne'er ſaw," and national animoſity is the creature of political deluſion.

Should a Frenchman and a Briton be caſt on a deſolate iſland, the national prejudice would inſtantly vaniſh, and the joy of meeting with an aſſociate in affliction would obliterate for a moment the idea of their mutual diſtreſs.

So powerful is the *principle* of UNIVERSAL PHILANTHROPY which the all-wiſe *Creator* has implanted in the *breaſt* of *man*, that it exiſts, and occaſionally burſts forth, even in thoſe who have been

been inured to acts of rapine, violence, and cruelty; who have been *ſyſtematically* barbariſed.

When the decree was paſſed in the convention, that the armies of the French Republic "ſhould "take no priſoners," a decree which is ſo ſuper-eminent in atrocity as to caſt at an awful diſtance the vileſt acts of deliberate barbarity which hiſtory has recorded, the armies of France, to their immortal honour, indignantly refuſed to obey the infernal mandate.

In the late glorious action, when the Indefatigable and the Amazon, attacked Les Droits De L'Homme, and the two latter, while fighting with equal bravery, ran on ſhore on the coaſt of France, the humane and generous natives, reſpecting the valour of their gallant enemy, by which they ſaw their own ſhip deſtroyed, were equally attentive to the preſervation of Engliſhmen as of their countrymen, from the common calamity to which the fate of war had brought them.*

Are

* The following extract of a letter from the 1ſt lieutenant of the Amazon to his brother at Plymouth, dated from Audievene, department of Finiſterre, Bretagne, 15th Jan. 1797,

Are ſuch heroic, generous nations to be longer conſidered as *natural* enemies ?*

Forbid it, *righteous heaven !* and grant that their fierce, their impolitic, their deſtructive contention may be immediately ſucceeded by an an alliance as durable, an amity as ſincere, as their preſent hoſtility is *irrational !*

The French are not, by nature, a cruel or malevolent people; nor are either their national prejudices, or the cruelties or enormities which ſtain the annals of the ſanguinary reign of Robeſpierre and his aſſociates, to be attributed to the depravity of the people, but to their inverted education,* to the examples of turpitude and barbarity continually before their eyes, and to the immoral and *atheiſtical* principles induſtriouſly propagated among them.

1797, proves the generoſity with which theſe gallant men were treated.

" We are treated exceedingly well, and ſcarcely feel our-
" ſelves as priſoners; we go either to Quimper or Breſt to-
" morrow, and expect to be exchanged ſhortly."

STAR, 18th Feb. 1797.

* Mr. Burke's Letters on a Regicide Peace.

The

The legiſlators of 1792 affected to form their conſtitution by the model of the Roman Republic, and they produced a copy which had nothing in common with the auguſt original but its defects, a copy "that was at once reſemblance and "diſgrace."

The inſatiable luſt of empire, the avidity of plunder, the uncontroulable exceſſes of military licentiouſneſs, the proſcriptions, the dictatorſhip, which tarniſh the luſtre of the Roman Republic, were all exceeded in that of France; while the happy mixture of * monarchy, ariſtocracy, and democracy, for which their government has been juſtly admired; its fidelity to engagements; its reverence for piety, temperance, frugality, chaſtity, and all the moral and ſocial duties which conſtitute the felicity and true glory of a nation, or a government, are ſtrongly and fatally contraſted by the principles and manners which the Jacobin ſyſtem eſtabliſhed in France.

They were not ignorant that equality of ſtation is incompatible with ſociety, that ſubordination is inſeparable from government, that virtue and order are eſſential to the enjoyment of liberty,

* The conſular dignity was the repreſentative of monarchy.

and that vice and licentiouſneſs infallibly deſtroy it; but they were equally certain, that the confuſion and anarchy their ſyſtem would produce muſt terminate in the tyranny they laboured to eſtabliſh, though it did not occur to them that power, ſo baſely obtained, muſt neceſſarily be tranſient and inſecure.

Earneſtly it is to be hoped, that their principles may not ſurvive their government and their crimes; ſince the preſent legiſlators of France have, in the conſtruction of their conſtitution, proved that they poſſeſs ability and inclination to avoid the errors of their predeceſſors.

This legiſlature has a graduated, conſiſtent, durable form; the glaring abſurdities of natural equality of rank (for even in a ſtate of nature there is no other abſolute equality) being preſerved in civil ſociety, and the eſtabliſhing a revolutionary * conſtitution, are now wiſely exploded.

They appear to be convinced of the inſtability of tyranny, the neceſſity of ſubordination, the in-

* A revolutionary conſtitution, a *floating ſtability*! this is a manifeſt political bull: as conſiſtently might we ſpeak of repulſive attraction, luminous darkneſs, or any other aſſemblage of contradictory qualities.

diſpenſable obligations of morality, the beauty of virtue, and the value of liberty.

If they thus perſevere in their endeavours to merit the eſteem, to reform the baſely vitiated manners, to reſtore the moral ſenſe, and to perpetuate the felicity of the truely great and reſpectable nation, who have delegated to them the ſacred truſt of governing, they will not only obtain, but deſerve their confidence.

Nor will Britain and France, nations ſo nearly approximated in ſituation, in government, in genius, in arts, in arms, be much longer divided in intereſts or affection. The increaſing light of reaſon and philoſophy will ſurely diſpel the miſt of error, pride, and ambition, which have ſo long concealed from them their true intereſt. It will admoniſh them, that, far from being natural enemies, they are natural allies.

So long ago as May, 1792, M. Chauvelin, in his note to Mr. Grenville, ſays, "France already looks on England as her natural ally."*

There

* See Mr. Erſkine's View of the Cauſes and Conſequences of the preſent War.

There is no reaſon to doubt that the unfortunate king, and the government M. Chauvelin *then* repreſented, were convinced of the truth of this aſſertion; but that king and that government were, long before the time in which he made it, deſtined to deſtruction.

Happy would it have been for England, for France, and for Europe, if this alliance had then been formed, and the conſtitution of 1789 been eſtabliſhed.

It was not till the writer of this eſſay had proceeded thus far, that he ſaw an extract of Mr. Erſkine's "View of the Cauſes and Conſequences of the preſent War;" but, highly as he honours the character, and readily as he acknowledges the ſuperiority of the eminent abilities of Mr. Erſkine, he cannot give up the exerciſe of his reaſon, and the conviction of his mind, to any authority, however reſpectable. He may probably be miſtaken, but he is not diſingenuous or inſincere. He reſpectfully ſubmits to the candid judgment of the impartial public the arguments he has ventured to lay before them, and the facts he has adduced. If the former are unfounded, or the latter miſrepreſented, they are not intentionally wrong; he will be thankful to be better informed; he is open to conviction, ſubmiſſive to juſt reproof, and ready to acknowledge miſtakes, and to retract errors. The cauſe he has engaged in *he believes* to be the cauſe of *truth*; but he is too well convinced of the fallibility of human reaſon to place implicit confidence in the rectitude of his own.

But

But the welfare of France, or the repoſe of Europe, were of little moment to an unprincipled faction, who looked on war as the only means to maintain their power, and had ſworn the deſtruction of monarchy in other countries, that they might perpetuate tyranny in their own.

No nations have ſo little to gain, or ſo much to loſe by a war with each other, as Britain and France. The extenſive foreign poſſeſſions of the Britiſh empire are all expoſed to the uncertain attacks of an enterpriſing enemy, and muſt be defended by an expenſe of men and money for which their intrinſic worth is by no means an equivalent; while our commerce is impaired by continual depredations, and taxed with high premiums of inſurance; while we riſk the ſtill greater miſchief of being involved in a continental war, ever attended with a profuſe, conſumptive, waſte of blood and treaſure; never compenſated with advantage; and ſeldom gratified with dear bought victory, or flattered with empty fame.

Nor are theſe the only evils which Britain has ſuſtained and muſt endure, or dread, while in a ſtate of competition with France.

The

The hiſtory of the preſent century proves both countries have paſſed the whole of it in a ſtate little better than that of actual hoſtility; and if the latter is to Britain a rapid conſumption, the former is a gradual decline. Our intervals of peace, though remiſſions of

"The dire diſeaſe which muſt ſubdue at length,"

have never placed us in a ſtate of convaleſcence; our foreign poſſeſſions we have always been obliged to keep in a reſpectable ſtate of defence; our navy, the great bulwark of the Britiſh iſles, the glory of our empire, the ſovereign of the ſea, has been, and muſt ſtill continue to be maintained, even in time of peace, in a ſtate of ſuch reſpectability and augmentation, as to be always prepared for war, while we have a rival to oppoſe who envies its glory, and dreads its reſiſtleſs power.

To theſe continual and increaſing drains of national wealth, from which even peace cannot exempt us, are to be added the ſtill more burdenſome accumulation of debt and taxes which every war entails on our country, and which neither the moſt rigid economy (rendered ſtill more difficult even by the cauſes which require its exer-

exertion), nor the moſt extenſive commerce, can alleviate, unleſs attended with a long interval of peace, which nothing but an alliance, a ſincere, *permanent* alliance with France, can give us reaſon to expect.

Should it be aſked whether there is no mean between alliance and hoſtility with France, I refer to the hiſtory of both countries ſince the conqueſt, and of the laſt ſixty years in particular, for an anſwer.

It has been during this whole period a ſtate of open or concealed enmity, of declared or premeditated war. And from what cauſes have the occaſional eruptions of theſe dreadful political volcanos of Europe ariſen, but from the pride, ambition, injuſtice, violence, and impolicy, which have reciprocally actuated the councils of England and France?

The oſtenſible cauſes of theſe wars are impeachments of the common ſenſe; the real ones, of the integrity and humanity of mankind.

What did France gain by the deſtructive war in the reign of William III. and the ſucceſſive war, in

in which Europe was ſo long, and ſo dangerouſly to her liberty, involved by the mad and wicked ambition of Louis XIV.? She ſaw that ambition foiled, and the independence of Europe preſerved, by the military genius, activity, perſeverance, and undaunted fortitude of our truly illuſtrious William III. And though our ſplendid victories in the ſucceeding reign were obſcured by the inglorious treaty of Utrecht, France gained by this victory nothing but the feeble alliance of Spain, the ſource of future wars. But the pride of her monarch, humbled by ſo many defeats by land and ſea, was gratified; England was diſappointed in the object of the grand alliance; and this was eſteemed a full compenſation for the loſſes and diſgrace France had ſuſtained by the war.

In all the ſucceeding wars, even to the preſent moment, it is evident that France and England have, by preferring *war* to *peace*, ſacrificed their *true* and permanent *intereſts*, merely to indulge the impolitic and malevolent deſire of *injuring each other*.

However ſuperior France may be to Britain in the population and contiguity of her territories, ſhe

ſhe has not at any time more to hope, or leſs to ſuffer and to dread from war, than Britain.

Though invaſion can effect little but partial, wanton, unavailing miſchief in either country, while the people are well-affected to their reſpective governments, the menace of it keeps the threatened country in a continual ſtate of expenſive preparation and anxious alarm. France, from the decided inferiority of its navy, has always more difficulty to encounter, either in reſiſting or attempting an invaſion, than Britain. In the late attempt on Ireland, nothing but the extraordinary good fortune of the French fleet, in eluding the ſuperior force of the Britiſh, ſaved the whole armament from capture or deſtruction; and if this eſcape encourages any future attempts, they will have ſtill greater difficulties to ſurmount.

Their continental wars have always been more injurious to them than to Britain, hurtful and expenſive as ſhe has ever found them to be.

It was juſtly ſaid by the late illuſtrious Earl of Chatham, who exalted to its higheſt pitch the glory of Britain, that "America was conquered

in Germany :"—and what Germany was to France, Gibraltar is to Spain.

By the unparlleled ſucceſs of the Britiſh arms in that glorious war, which ended in the peace of Paris in 1763, we diſpoſſeſſed the French of Canada, and thus prepared the way for the independence of the American States. This event, facilitated by the impolitic interference of France, neceſſarily produced a change in the opinions of the French nation, which gave birth to the conſtitntion of 1789.

This appeared to be the auſpicious æra in which the ancient impolitic animoſity between France and England might have been ſucceeded by a firm and durable alliance. Too near in ſituation, too equal in power, to regard each other with the apathy of neutrality, they muſt have a common or an oppoſite intereſt; they muſt be in union or hoſtility; they muſt be faithful allies or inveterate enemies. Surely the hard-earned experience of *eight centuries* might admoniſh them that their true intereſt conſiſts in *union.*

The headlong precipice before them might warn them both of the inevitable deſtruction that awaits

awaits them, if they purſue their deſperate courſe. What avail the ſplendid victories of France in Italy, or the no leſs ſignal triumphs of Britain in either India, or on the ocean, if they oppoſe increaſing obſtacles to that peace on which their national exiſtence depends? They cannot ſubdue, though they may deſtroy, each other. The powers which now ſit as calm, ſecure ſpectators of their mortal conflict, may cruſh them while they thus "render the faint quittance" of exhauſted vigour, and their fatal conqueſt will "crumble "from their expiring graſp."

At ſuch a criſis, are the parade, the etiquette, of miniſters and the Directory; are Belgium, are the French Weſt India iſlands, depopulated by war, by peſtilence, and by the ſtill more dreadful ſcourge of Jacobin liberty; are the Cape of Good Hope and Trincomale to be put in competition with the national ſalvation of Britain and of France?

Are cauſes ſo comparatively trivial to prevent that alliance on which their ſafety depends?

The preſent is not a war for conqueſt, or for glory; not a war of nations nor of governments, but of opinions; and if a ſpirit of *mutual conciliation* could ſubdue the pertinacity with which theſe opinions have been fatally retain-

ed, the reſpective claims ariſing from reciprocal conqueſts might admit a fair and liberal diſcuſſion.

The alliance of Britain with France would not only preſerve them from deſtruction, but afford them mutual, ineſtimable, and permanent benefits; their foreign poſſeſſions, no longer conſidered as objects of ambitious contention, or employed as engines of hoſtile annoyance, would become ſources of mutual proſperity; the repoſe of Europe would be ſecure from interruption; Britain would obtain that relaxation from war, and the government of France that ſtability and ſupport, from our powerful protection, which is ſo eſſentially neceſſary to their exiſtence.

Even now, in danger of momentary deſtruction from the convulſions of contending factions, nothing can avert it on the return of peace, and the recal of their numerous armies, but the ſupport that government muſt previouſly aſſure itſelf of obtaining from alliance; and no ally can ſo effectually afford it as Britain.

Neither the government (or, if the phraſe is more agreeable to thoſe who are anxious to take *a ſpell* at the national helm, the adminiſtration) of this

this country, nor the *preſent* government of France, were the authors of the war, but that uſurped tyrannical government, now execrated in France itſelf, whoſe exiſtence will only be remembered by its crimes.

The late overture made by adminiſtration for peace was declared (and might, however unreaſonably, be believed) by the Directory of France, to be inſincere; yet neither that belief, wholly unſupported by evidence, nor that pretended inadmiſſibility of the terms propoſed, could juſtify the ignominious diſmiſſion of the Britiſh ambaſſador. His Majeſty's meſſage to Parliament, and the declaration of the 29th December, expreſsly teſtify his readineſs to receive any future overtures on the part of the Directory; the ſincerity of the Britiſh government in the late unſucceſsful negotiation, and their anxious deſire to terminate a war in which they were compelled by inevitable neceſſity to engage, or treacherouſly and puſillanimouſly to ſurrender the conſtitution and the independence of the Britiſh nation.

This is the light in which the great majority, not only in Parliament, but of the people, view the conduct of adminiſtration; and the voice of the

the people muſt on this, as it ſhould on every great political queſtion, ultimately decide.

But however opinions may vary reſpecting the origin of the war, which is *now* a queſtion rather of ſpeculative curioſity, or of party intereſt, than of national importance, its *continuance* can only be aſcribed to the impolitic averſion of the French government to peace.

After having allowed compenſation to be the equitable baſis of the negotiation, on what principle could they reject the terms propoſed by the Britiſh government, as being inadmiſſible?

By refuſing to reſtore Belgium, or even to enter on any diſcuſſion reſpecting its reſtitution, they withheld the *only* compenſation which Britain required for the conqueſts ſhe offered to reſtore. The indemnification of the Emperor, by the ceſſion of provinces in Italy and its vicinity, could be *no compenſation* for Britain, while Belgium was to remain a conquered province of France, to the manifeſt and very material detriment of Britain—to the obſtruction of her commerce in peace—to the hazard of her ſafety in war. But the reſtitution of Belgium, it was pretended, was "*inadmiſſible*," becauſe, being declared to conſti-

tute

tute a part of the " republic of France, one and indiviſible," the Directory could not treat reſpecting its reſtitution. Equally reaſonable would it be for the Britiſh legiſlature to paſs an act, that the Cape of Good Hope, or Hiſpaniola, ſhould be conſidered as an inſeparable part of the Britiſh empire; and for adminiſtration to aſſert, that any propoſals on the part of France for their reſtitution was inadmiſſible; and, inſtead of referring the propoſal to the ſupreme legiſlature, always competent to repeal its own acts, to break off the negotiation, and ignominiouſly to diſmiſs the ambaſſador who ſhould propoſe it.

Should it be alledged that the caſes are not parallel, becauſe the incorporation of Belgium with the French republic was the act of the *Belgic people*, and therefore cannot be repealed by the government of France; it may juſtly be anſwered, that the reſolutions of municipalities and corporate bodies, extorted by the terror of an irreſiſtible armed force, and the menace of exorbitant fines and arbitrary requiſitions, can only be regarded as the act of a free people by thoſe who conſider the Jacobin uſurpation to be a free government; who call robbery " fraternity," oppreſſion " liberty," and poverty " equality."

But whatever the ſentiments of the people of Belgium may be reſpecting the treatment they have received from the government of France, *that* people are alone competent to decide; and the Directory, inſtead of imperiouſly telling them and the whole world, that they muſt, from henceforth, be indiſſolubly *chained* to the French republic, ſhould have left the election of their future governors, or the choice of maſters, to themſelves. It is their unalienable right, and they *will*, ſooner or latter, aſſert it.

If it may be as allowable to hope, as it is rational and benevolent, ſincerely to wiſh, that a ſpirit of *conciliation*, of amity, and mutual confidence, may ſucceed to that of hoſtility, averſion, and diſtruſt, and may actuate alike the nations, the governors, and the councils of Britain and France; the abſolute independence of Belgium and Holland, would at once remove the *pretended* obſtructions to peace; and an alliance may be formed, which would inſure the triumph of liberty, the repoſe of the world, the admiration and applauſe of ſucceeding ages, and the *favour of heaven*.

THE END.